

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action of November 26, 2008, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-24, and present new claims 25-32 for consideration. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made herein. Accordingly, entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 25-32 distinguish from the reference of *Unger* (U.S. Patent No. 6,164,789) cited in the Office Action for at least the reasons stated below.

New claims 25 and 32 recite, *inter alia*, that (1) the display device comprises a backlight device; (2) the device case encloses the plurality of light sources; and (3) the light distribution surface area occupied by the light sources is greater than the display area of the display panel. *Unger* fails to disclose or even suggest a backlight with the above features. Unlike the claimed invention, *Unger* teaches an edge-lit device. In addition, reference number 210 in *Unger* (construed as a “device case” in the Office Action) actually designates a waveguide that is placed apart from the illumination source 70, and reference number 212 indicates the input surface of the waveguide 210 that faces the illumination source 70. See col. 4, lines 12-15: “*at the junction of the illumination source 70 and the tapered coupling waveguide 210, an air gap 260 is provided to maximize refraction of the light as it enters the tapered coupling waveguide 210.*” *Unger* thus does not disclose or suggest any device case that encloses the light sources, as the claims require. Instead, *Unger* teaches a waveguide positioned in front of the illumination source.

Moreover, *Unger* also fails to teach and suggest a light distribution surface area occupied by the light sources that is greater than the display area of the display panel. As a result, the intensity of light in *Unger* may decrease along the path through the waveguide 210, especially at the side edges far away from the input surface 212, which may adversely lead to non-uniform

light intensity striking on the display area of the display panel. Because the light distribution surface of the light sources is greater than the display area of the display panel with tilted reflective sidewalls of the device case, at least one advantage of the claimed invention is the ability to directly irradiate light uniformly to the display area of the display panel without light decay at the peripheral regions of the display panel, as shown in the Fig. 2A-2F of the application.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claims 25 and 32, and related dependent claims 26-31 patently distinguish from the teachings of *Unger*. Reconsideration and allowance is thus respectfully requested for these claims.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all of the Examiner's rejections, Applicants believe that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner grant such an action. If any questions or issues remain in the resolution of which the Examiner feels will be advanced by a conference with the Applicants' attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the attorney at the number noted below. No fee should be due. If otherwise, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3420, reference 87159200-242006 (Dai).

Dated: February 5, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /M. Michael Dai/

M. Michael Dai

Registration No.: 47,512

BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP

Pennzoil Place, South Tower

711 Louisiana, Suite 3400

Houston, TX 77002-2746

(713) 427-5056

(713) 427-5099 (Fax)